DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 466 459 SP 040 913

AUTHOR	Stevens, Dannelle D.; Demirezen, Gulsen
TITLE	Student Teacher Mentors in Turkey: New Program Challenges Traditional Relationships.
PUB DATE	2002-04-00
NOTE	14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Faculty Development; Foreign Countries; High Schools; Higher Education; *Mentors; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Development; *Student Teachers
IDENTIFIERS	Turkey

ABSTRACT

Mentoring a student teacher not only affects student teacher development but may also have a concomitant effect on the mentor's development. In Turkey, with a long tradition of an apprenticeship model in learning to teach and a traditional teacher education program, how mentors respond to student teachers and how they use this experience to further their own development may be problematic. The purpose of this study is to describe and explain Turkish mentor teachers' beliefs and knowledge about student teacher development, their own development, and the new university role in their schools. Researchers analyzed surveys from 25 mentors, minutes from 3 end-of-year program evaluation meetings, and 2 in-depth mentor teacher interviews. Results indicate that the Turkish mentor teachers were generally positive about student teacher growth in the program while at the same time a little less positive about their own professional development as a mentor. Thus, even though the new national teacher education program challenges the traditional Turkish apprenticeship model of learning to teach, Turkish mentor teachers have responded positively. (Contains 18 references.) (Author/SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dannelle D. Stevens

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Student teacher mentors in Turkey:

New program challenges traditional relationships

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Dannelle D. Stevens, Ph.D.

Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey

stevensd@bilkent.edu.tr

Gulsen Demirezen

Ozel Bilkent Lisesi, Ankara, Turkey

gulsend@bilkent.ed.tr

ED 466 459

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, April, 2002.

ABSTRACT

Mentoring a student teacher not only affects student teacher development but may have a concomitant effect on the mentor's development. In Turkey with a long tradition of an apprenticeship model in learning to teach and a traditional teacher education program, how mentors respond to student teachers and how they use this experience to further their own development may be problematic. The purpose of the study is to describe and explain Turkish mentor teachers' beliefs and knowledge about student teacher development, their own development and the new university role in their schools. We analyzed surveys from 25 mentors, minutes from 3 end-of-year program evaluation meetings and two in-depth mentor teacher interviews. Results indicate that the Turkish mentor teachers were generally positive about student teacher growth in the program while at the same time a little less positive about their own professional development as a mentor. Thus, even though the new national teacher education program challenges the traditional Turkish apprenticeship model of learning to teach, Turkish mentor teachers have responded positively.

SP040913

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Mentor teachers play a central role in the development of student teachers (Hawkey, 1977). First, they pass on tacit knowledge of school culture (Zeicher & Gore, 1990). Second, they open up the practice setting in the "real" world of their own classrooms to the novice (Feiman-Nemser, Parker & Zeichner, 1993). Finally, they are responsible for observing the student teacher in her lessons and giving constructive feedback to student teachers on teaching skills (Williams, Butt & Soares, 1992).

Mentoring can not only have an effect on the development of the student teacher but can have a concomitant effect on the mentor's development (Elliott, 1995; Hawkey, 1997). Mentors can build a knowledge base about how to work effectively with the adult learner, such as how to give substantive feedback that is acted upon, or how to document teaching through written observations (Kerka, 1998; Zimpher & Rieger, 1988). As student teachers bring research-based and university-endorsed methods to the classroom, mentor teachers are often exposed to a new repertoire of teaching strategies. After watching the student teacher and seeing the response of their own students to these methods, they may try out some of the methods themselves. However, in a transitional society like Turkey where there is not a long tradition of well-developed mentoring, these effects may be different than expected.

Context

A central piece of this study is how the student teacher-mentor teacher relationship works in the Turkish schools today. Very recently significant changes have occurred in Turkish teacher education (Sands, 2001). To provide the context for mentor teacher development in Turkey, we will discuss the teacher preparation programs and school-based mentors' roles only 2 years ago before YOK, the Council of Higher Education, initiated a new national teacher education program.

What role have Turkish teacher played in the past in the preparation of new teachers? Up until 1999, as part of their four-year university preparation program student teachers spent two weeks in the schools to do their practice teaching. During these two weeks, they were required to teach 4 lessons. This was the only school-based experience they received prior to receiving their teaching certificate. The teaching practice was usually part of or at the end of either a four-year program or an intensive six-month certificate program of "formation" courses at the university. Most mentor teachers "tolerated" the invasion of their classes by these strangers (6-10 students per mentor) for a short period of time. However, if the student teacher did not get along with the mentor for any reason, their attempts to practice teach were thwarted (Erbas, personal communication).

Before 1999, the work of university teacher education professors was clouded with historical loyalties to academic departments, with research expectations or with poorly defined program responsibilities. These professors had extremely large class loads and did not go into the schools to observe the student teachers. They did not see this as part of their workload and were reluctant to enter the schools. Universities had a difficult and strained relationship with the schools (Guncher, 1998).

*****INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE********

All K-12 schools, on the other hand, realized that the national teacher preparation program did not adequately prepare their newly hired teachers (Guncher, 1998). Thus, the schools would not give the newly hired teacher full responsibility for any single class during the first year of their work in the school. Each new teacher would have to do an internship year, of lower pay and with reduced class loads. Often these new hires would serve as substitute teachers. In addition, the new hire may have a mentor teacher to observe them, give feedback and to assist

in the development of their teaching skills. The larger schools like the private school, TED Ankara College in Ankara, Turkey with 5000 K-12 students and 450 teachers, hired a full-time staff developer to plan and implement the first-year teacher training program (Guven, F., 2002). Other schools, like the public schools, cannot afford this kind of preparation program and new hires may find themselves struggling to learn on-the-job. Even with the new program, instituted in 1999, the Ministry of Education requires teachers to spend their first two months in schools with no responsibilities and have a "staj" year of reduced class loads (from 50-75% of a regular teacher's load). For some schools this also means a reduced salary for their first year of teaching. Schools like TED Ankara hire the teachers to start work in July to overcome the two-month requirement where they "hang out" in a school with no responsibility.

The foundation of this old system is an adult learning model that more closely follows the apprenticeship system where the apprentice learns on-the-job under the tutelage of the "expert". The apprenticeship model has a long history in Turkish society. We see this today in the preparation of school administrators where there is no academic program or license to become a school principal. Just a "tap on the shoulder" from the current administrator, starts a teacher on the path to school administration. Furthermore, as this apprenticeship system is played out in schools for teacher training, there is no role for the university supervisor or, even less of a role for the new, research-based ideas that the student teacher might want to use. We argue that many new teachers found themselves learning-on-the-job with little theoretical background, a narrow repertoire of teaching strategies and even less experience in making the connection between theory and practice through reflection (Erbas, 2000).

In 1999, following four years of study and consultation with Turkish and international educators in a World Bank Program, YOK mandated a change in teacher education in all universities in Turkey. No longer could students receive a teaching license with so little classroom experience. No longer could university faculty not make contact with the schools, mentors and student teachers in the schools. Student teachers must work with mentor teachers and be supervised by university faculty in their field placements for at least one day a week over a year. At the same time, students were required to take a 36 semester-credit sequence of teacher formation courses. For the first time as well, a Masters degree program was approved so that students could major in content-based subjects as undergraduates but still receive a teaching license through a graduate program. In the fall of 2000, this Masters-level graduate program was instituted at Bilkent University where this study takes place.

These recent programs in teacher education are summarized on Table 1. Prior to 1982, teacher education was even more divorced from universities and left to Village Institutes. Because these Institutes could not keep up with the need, revisions were made at that time. The new 1999 teacher education program is the result of a collaboration of Turkish teachers, university teacher educators, and Western consultants. This program follows a more Western model that requires a different role for the mentor teacher as well as the university supervisor, not to mention the additional time commitment for the student teacher. These roles are adequately described in what everyone now uses and calls, "The Blue Book" which clearly outlines activities, competencies, new roles and responsibilities for university faculty, schools, universities, mentors and student teachers (Koc, et al, 1998).

In this paper, we are focusing on the impact of the Bilkent teacher education program on the mentor teacher's beliefs and knowledge. The student teachers have more time in schools, more formation courses whose theories are supposed to be linked to that time in schools, more lessons to teach and more opportunity to develop a relationship with the mentor teacher and the school community in which they have their school experiences. This is obviously a substantive

change from the traditional way of educating a new teacher. This is also not the way the Turkish mentor teachers themselves have been educated to become teachers. The mentors have learned to teach in the old apprenticeship model. In the new model they will need to relate to a student teacher who has spent more time in classrooms, has more teaching "formation" courses related to work in schools and will probably know some different teaching strategies than the mentor teacher herself. Given the strain that this new model might present to the mentor, the purpose of this study is describe the program's impact on Turkish mentor teacher beliefs and knowledge about

- their student teacher's development,
- their professional knowledge about being a mentor and seeing new teaching strategies demonstrated in their classroom,
- the university role in their schools?

Methods

This paper describes a study of 25 mentor teachers' beliefs and knowledge across three private Turkish high schools ("colleges") where the Graduate School of Education at Bilkent University placed 24 student teachers. These private schools offer classes in Turkish language (history, Turkish language and literature) and English (sciences and math, English language and literature, art, music). In the Bilkent new teacher education program during their first year, students spend one day a week in schools working with mentor teachers while simultaneously taking "formation" courses at the university. The Bilkent program is a two-year graduate program. During the students' first semester half were placed at School 1, the other half at School 2. During the second semester, all were placed at School 3. Our high school student teachers were being prepared to teach biology, Turkish history, Turkish language and literature or English as a second language.

Each mentor teacher had 2-3 student teachers who observed and eventually practiced 1 to 5 lessons in their classrooms. The mentor teacher was responsible for setting up a program so that the student teachers could observe in other classrooms as well during their full day at the school. Student teachers were required to complete a set of written activities based on observations and discussions with the mentor teacher. These weekly activities as well as resulting teacher competencies are published in "Work in Schools" which has been distributed to all teacher education programs in Turkey (Sands & Ozcelik, 1997).

At School 1 and School 2 the mentor teacher had a 2 hour training from university faculty prior to launching the new program. During this session, the university faculty described the new model of teacher preparation where the work in the field was integrated with the teacher formation courses on campus. For instance, when the students were observing teacher questioning styles, the campus faculty were teaching about questioning in the methods classes and the student teachers were doing a microteaching lesson that included a question-and-answer session. In addition, in School 3, the university had two training sessions (2.5 hours each) with the mentors on how to observe, give substantive feedback and encourage the student teachers to reflect on their work. University supervisors went to the schools at least every other week to work with the mentors and the student teachers to foster communication and to answer any questions that the mentors might have.

Data Sources

The first data source is **surveys** (either in English or Turkish) that were distributed to the mentors at the end of each semester to assess mentor attitudes and experiences working with the student teachers and with the university. The work of Feiman-Nemser (1996) guided the

development of the survey so that the items focused on mentor perceptions of student teacher growth, their own professional development and relations with the university. School-university partnerships were new in this case and there are potential trouble spots in these relationships (Stevens, 1999; Stevens & Everhart, 2000). It is important to assess the relationship between the university and the schools to support a strong mentor program (Temple & Stevens, 2000). Second, the **minutes** from the mentor teachers'-university faculty end-of-term meeting were analyzed to determine themes and to compare the reliability of the data collected in the written surveys. Finally, two **interviews** were conducted with two Turkish teachers (one was co-author of this paper) from School 1. Both of these teachers were involved in mentoring in schools as well as working with university faculty in their teaching methods classes (history & biology).

By comparing the results of the three data sources, we can compare the findings to determine the content validity. In addition, having a Turkish cultural "informant" as co-author of the paper, any cultural misinterpretations were identified and clarified. For content validity, we are asking, do these methods do a good job of sampling what we are interested in, Turkish mentor teacher beliefs, experience and knowledge about being mentors in the new teacher education program (House, 1980)?

In developing the **survey**, the 12 item, 4-point Likert-scale survey items were clustered into three themes:

1. mentor teacher perceptions of student teacher development
2. mentor teacher perceptions of their own development as mentor
3. mentor teacher perception of the role of the university in the program.

These themes were derived from the literature on mentor teacher development (Feiman-Nemser, Parker & Zeichner, 1993) that indicates that we can expect mentor teachers to have different and important distinctions between these three areas. We received 25 out of 36 surveys back from the teachers, a response rate across both Turkish and English speakers of 69%. Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were gathered for each item on the survey. Short-answer responses were written out and also clustered under common themes.

The meeting **minutes** were important because teachers were able to express their concerns and successes in working in this new program verbally. Although there can be problems with this public disclosure, in combination with the survey and the interviews, the meeting notes provide a reliability check for the survey results and can inform the more in-depth interviews. A meeting also allows the group to stimulate each others' thinking about their experiences in the new program.

Seventy-five percent of the mentors were present at the feedback meetings. At all three meetings the teachers brought the survey into the meeting and we referred to it in our discussion of the program feedback. We brainstormed a list of mentor observations and advice to the university. Following the meeting, these data were clustered to find common themes and this information was sent back to the schools for their final review and acceptance as to its veracity.

Finally, a separate in-depth open-ended **interview** was conducted with two Turkish high school teachers at School 1. The teachers were selected from School 1 because they also attended some of the university methods classes on campus. The purpose of the interview was to not only examine the mentor teachers' beliefs, experiences and knowledge about working with the student teachers but, also, to examine more closely the potential "ripple effect" that might occur when student teachers suggest and maybe even practice methods in their classes that they may never have used before. The student teachers practiced methods in microteaching such as class discussion, role plays, map-reading skills or experiments. We wanted to know if the mentor teachers used these methods in the past and, if not, might be using some of these new methods in

their classrooms because they saw a student teacher demonstrate them. We assumed that teachers might not reveal the "ripple effect" in the survey or in the general discussion because it shows them in a learner, non-expert mode. Therefore, we decided that an interview would help us to better assess the "ripple effect".

During the second semester, each of the interviewed mentor teachers also regularly (66% of classes) attended with the student teachers the history or biology methods classes on the university campus and participated in the feedback sessions during microteaching. Since the first author of this paper is not Turkish, the second author, the high school history teacher, not only participated in the interview but also collaborated with the first author on the interpretation of the results. Her participation strengthens the content validity of the findings through discussion of the findings in relation to her own development as an experienced (8-year) veteran native Turkish high school teacher.

The second teacher interviewed is a high school biology teacher. She has 15 years experience teaching biology. Since both teachers participated in the teacher education methods classes on campus as well as mentored the biology or history student teachers, they would be most likely to change their classroom methods. If they did not change or reflect more deeply on their classroom practices, then, the program could be considered weak, indeed. Thus, these two teachers would be the best representatives of the greatest potential strength of the program on mentor teacher professional growth.

The questions that Gulsen and Sema answered in the **in-depth interview** were:

- What do the student teachers need to know to be successful in Turkish schools?
- How different is this program from the way you learned to teach?
- What effect did being a mentor have on your own professional knowledge about teaching?
- What role in your teaching did the university methods classes play in your own teaching?
- Did you change any of your own teaching practices because of involvement with the program? If so, which ones? How did it work for you?
- How do other teachers feel about the impact of the student teachers on their own practice?
- What effect did being a mentor have on your second year of work with our first year students? Did you learn anything the first year that you implemented the second year?
- What advice would you give to other mentors who might be new to the program?

Both teachers wanted the questions ahead of time and wrote out their answers before the one-hour interview. Their English language usage is strong so the interviews were conducted in English. Having worked in Turkey for 2 years, the first author has found that it is typical of Turks to not want to do something like an interview spontaneously. Also, since English is not the native language of each teacher, they wanted to make sure they had the vocabulary to answer the questions the way they wanted to. Thus, both teachers preferred to think about the questions carefully ahead of time. The interviews lasted an hour each. The first author conducted the interview, took notes, transcribed the notes and gave them to each teacher afterwards for a reliability check.

Results

The **survey demographics** indicated that the teachers who worked with our students were very experienced. All except one of the 25 mentors who returned their survey had over 5 years teaching experience and 11 had over 15 years teaching experience. The vast majority (66%) of the teachers were native speakers of Turkish with School 3 having the most native Turkish speakers (8 out of 9). There was only one significant difference in the native English or native

Turkish speakers in their responses to the survey. In addition, the majority (68%) have had student teachers before either in their home country or under the traditional Turkish teacher education model.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

The mentor responses to the **survey statements** that related to student teacher development were rated higher as a group than those related to mentor growth and development. The scale is a 4 point, Likert-type scale with 4= Strongly agree. In other words, the mentors felt that the student teachers learned a lot during their work with them and were responsive to feedback from the mentors.

Student teachers learned a lot (3.68).

Student teachers were responsive to feedback (3.66).

Among the cluster of items related to mentor self-perceptions, mentor enjoyment was rated highest (3.56). However, the means of three survey items that focused on mentor growth were lower than those above related to student development.

Being a mentor was a positive growth experience for me (3.34).

Being a mentor was an opportunity for me to reflect on my own practice (3.30).

I learned a lot from my student teacher (3.05).

The only item on the survey that showed a significant difference between the Turkish and the English speaker mentors was "Being a mentor was a positive growth experience for me." The Turkish mean was 3.44 whereas the English speaker mean was 3.13. This indicates that the Turkish mentors enjoyed working with the student teachers significantly more than the English speakers.

The only negative item in the survey, "The student teachers took too much time," indicated that most mentors were not overburdened by the "invasion" of this "stranger" to their classroom and school (2.32).

Generally teachers were moderately enthusiastic about receiving more mentor training (mean = 3.03). Yet, all teachers indicated that they all wanted to be a mentor next year by selecting a 3(agree) or a 4 (strongly agree) choice with a mean of 3.38.

To facilitate change to this new model of both student and mentor teacher development, the university had to build a trusting relationship with the mentors. One survey item indicated that we are laying the foundation for this relationship. ("The university staff responded in a timely manner to my questions and concerns." mean = 3.50).

The end-of-term meeting **minutes** at each school indicated that the teachers wanted to increase their opportunities for contact with the student teachers, especially at the beginning of the term. Analysis and clustering of themes from the meeting minutes indicated that the mentors felt that student teachers need "more time in schools". This was the resounding cry across all schools. Student teachers need more time with their individual mentors, more opportunity to practice teach, more time to see continuity of instruction. "Why only one day a week?" was asked at each school meeting. According to Dr. Margaret Sands who led the technical assistance team for the World Bank-YOK project for change in teacher education in Turkey over the last 5 years, even to require one day a week practice in schools was a "revolution" for YOK and the Turkish Ministry of Education (Sands, personal communication).

The mentor **interview** corroborated the data from Guncher (1998) when he describes the teacher training practices prior to this new teacher education model in Turkey. Both teachers had minimal training, 6 weeks in the summer just prior to entrance in the classroom. They learned on-the-job. Sema indicates the contrast between her training and what she saw in our program this way,

> This Bilkent program is very, very different and very useful. Your student teachers are taught everything-- classroom management, how to relate to staff, their clothing. Most of my friends in Turkey went through the same preparation program I did because of so many needs for teachers. All we had was 6 weeks in the summer-- all branches (departments) and I was immediately given 6 classes at the secondary level in the middle school.... After my first year, I took a year off and studied on my own. (In the university methods classes) I saw that what took me 2-3 years to learn, Margaret (Dr. Sands) could teach in 1-2 minutes.

Gulsen also indicated her positive response to the program.

> Your program is very different. Your students learn watching (observing). They see many different teachers and can find the best teacher for them. They can decide if they really want to be a teacher.... This is the second education for them and it is full and meaningful.

On the topic of their own growth, both Gulsen and Sema acknowledged that their involvement in the program has had an effect on their teaching practices. For Sema, there were specific practices that she incorporated into her lessons.

> I started using transparencies much more. It is a waste of time to draw on the board. I made some plays and games that the student teachers had used. I realized that they took only 10 minutes and my high school students responded well; we did not lose time with games.

Gulsen, too, mentioned specific practices that she changed:

> I learned how to plan better for my own students, how to help them give presentations. My own students are more excited because of these things-- how to search for things, how to find references. I now use different teaching techniques like problem-solving and critical thinking and drama. I write a daily agenda on the board now. I am keeping a journal and I learned how to use technology and the internet better. I became more concerned about getting students involved in the class. I change activities in a class period when the students are bored. I am more organized.

Other changes for Gulsen were more global and had more to do with how she saw herself in the classroom and how she saw her role.

> When students observed me, I got better. I had to be a good model for them....They are young and they gave me new energy.... I realized that part of my job was to be a good role model. I need to constantly improve myself and help them get a good job. I serve as a 'guide'.

For both teachers there was a "ripple effect" in terms of how they saw what they were doing before the program. For Sema, attending the methods classes gave her "self-confidence" that what she had learned the hard way, on and off the job, was good practice. For Gulsen, ... "I was able to show my professional good side and realized I like my job."

What did each of the teachers learn from being a mentor the first year? Both expressed the idea that it was important to get involved with the student teachers more. Sema said, "The first year I did not push them to get involved in the classes.... This year I pushed them more." Gulsen echoed the same idea about her second year of involvement with the program,

> This year I am more experienced so I took different measures- to learn the school rules, to work with other teachers in harmony, to get more practice in the classroom, taking role, doing small tasks... to have them tell about their life and background to the classes. They had a closer relationship with the students this year. Last year they were more like strangers. I added them to the class activities. Last year they watched mostly.

According to Sema, one serious constraint on changing her classroom practices is the Turkish multiple-choice university entrance examination, the "dreaded OSS". All students go to the Dersane (preparation courses) after school and on weekends for at least their last two years of high school. She said that her teaching and knowledge must equal that of a Dersane teacher or she will not be respected. She must impart many bits of knowledge for students to be successful on the exam. Gulsen did not mention this constraint although her history students face the same test for college entrance.

Advice for mentors in the future indicated that both teachers felt that they learned to be more open-minded to the ideas of the student teachers. "Ask their opinions. Ask questions rather than give advice, like 'What will you do if.... this happens?'"

In summary both mentors spoke of changing their own teaching practices as well as developing in their role as mentors over the two years of the program.

Limitations

The limitations of this study are that there were only 3 groups of mentor teachers surveyed at three schools. In addition, although there are over 200 private schools in Turkey, these teachers represent only a small minority of teachers. It would hard to generalize the results to other masters teacher education programs, even in Turkey. Presently there are fewer than 1000 students in Turkish Masters teacher training programs. In addition, even though the case study strengthens the content validity of the study, it is a case of only two teachers in two subject areas and is therefore not generalizable.

Educational Significance

Why is this study important? Prior to the initiation of the new teacher education program two years ago, Turkish teachers learned how to teach either on-the-job or as an apprentice at the school site. The new model of teacher education challenges those traditional practices which breed separating theory from practice and distancing of schools and universities. Our student teachers need a positive relationship with their mentor teacher so they are not seen as "strangers" in the classrooms. All of our students are native Turks. Our student teachers are practicing methods in their university classes that they never experienced in their schools as students. They need the "space" to practice these new methods in mentor teacher classrooms. From my observations of mentor teacher classrooms in each of the three schools as a university supervisor, the mentor teachers use very few student-centered practices like discussion, debates, group work or projects. The typical Turkish high school classroom is dominated by classroom recitation-teacher lecture followed by a question and answer session.

One interesting point is that, except for one item, the Turkish teachers did not respond significantly differently to the survey from the non-native speakers of Turkish (English-language native) teachers. What does this tell us? That teaching is teaching is teaching no matter what your prior teaching experience? Or, that mentoring is mentoring is mentoring no matter what your cultural background is? We can begin to tease out the differences here- even in Turkey- through the interviews. The two Turkish teachers interviewed were excited and willing to try new ideas wherever they found them-- in the practice of the student teachers or in the methods classes..

What have we learned from mentors about our program as well as about how to facilitate a "ripple" effect in mentor teacher practices?

1. Through even moderate mentor training, the university can guide the mentors on how to work with student teachers. A list of suggested facilitative interactions with student will be helpful. These were presented to the mentor teachers during the mentor training session.

- Be open-minded.

- Ask their opinions.
- Ask questions rather than give advice.
- Introduce them around the school.
- Do not let them sit in the back and not get involved in the class.

2. Mentors can learn things from watching the student teacher "demonstrate" new practices in the classroom. Even though these mentors had minimal university training on mentoring, they recognized that the new teachers were learning what took them 2 or 3 years to learn. In addition, they were willing to try out some of the practices that they observed the student teacher demonstrate.

3. Mentor teacher change seems to be facilitated when mentors can attend and even participate in university methods classes. Both mentors mentioned that the university methods classes were important for them because they saw new ideas demonstrated, they participated in feedback to students during microteaching and they affirmed some of their current practices.

The university program is not only asking student teacher to teach in ways that they were never taught, we are also asking mentor teachers to work hand-in-hand with student teachers. In this process, we hoped that the mentor would also focus on his/her own professional development as a mentor in this relationship. This is a radical change from the apprenticeship model where the master knew all the answers and it was the task of the apprentice to duplicate the expert practice of the master. The mentor teachers in our schools want to be mentors in the second year and some would like more training as mentors. In the interview, we found that just being a mentor and observing university methods classes, prompted a change in both classroom practices and mentor practices.

Footnote:

It is a tribute not only to the many people who make the Bilkent program successful and to the Turkish teachers themselves that they were willing to become mentors and participate in this new program for student teachers. This was a risk to have observers in their classrooms for the first time, to open up their practice and to share what they know about teaching. The Turkish teachers participated with grace, humility and professionalism in the training of future teachers in Turkey. We want to acknowledge their risk-taking and their ability to make a difference not only in the lives of the student teachers but also in the lives of their own students and certainly, we hope, in the lives of the students our student teachers teach.

REFERENCES

Guncher, B. (1998). Restructuring of teacher education programs in faculties of education. Ankara, Turkey: Council of Higher Education.

Elliott, B. (1995). Developing relationships: Significant episodes in professional development. Teachers and teaching. Theory and practice, 1(2), 247-264.

Erbas, S. (2001). Personal communication. Chair, Curriculum and Instruction, Marmara University, Cannakale, Turkey.

Feiman-Nemser, S., Parker, M. B. & Zeichner, K. (1993). Are mentor teachers teacher educators? In D. McIntyre, H. Hagger, & M. Wilkin (Eds.), Mentoring: Perspectives on school-based teacher education (pp. 166-189). London: Kogan-Page.

Guven, F. (2002). Personal communication. Director of new teacher orientation and research. TED Ankara College, Ankara, Turkey.

Hawkey, K. (1997). Roles, responsibilities and relationships in mentoring: A literature review and agenda for research. Journal of Teacher Education, 48(5), 325-335.

House, E. R. (1980). Evaluating with validity. Beverly Hills:Sage.

Kerka, S. (1998). New perspectives on mentoring. Eric Digest No. 194. ED418249.

Koc, S. et al. (1998). Faculty-School Partnership. Ankara, Turkey: Turkish Council of Higher Education (YOK).

Sands, M. K. & Ozcelik, D. A. (1997). Work in Schools. Ankara, Turkey: Turkish Council of Higher Education (YOK).

Sands, M. K. (2001). Personal Communication. Director, Graduate School of Education, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.

Sands, M. K. (Dec. 2001). Bilkent Teacher Education Program. Proceedings of International Conference on Improving Teacher Education. Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.

Stevens, D. D. (1999). The ideal, real and surreal in school-university partnerships: Reflections of a boundary spanner. Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal, 15(3), 287-299.

Stevens, D. D. & Everhart, R. E. (2000). Designing and tailoring school-university partnerships: A straightjacket, security blanket or just a loose coat. The Professional Educator, 22(2), 39-49.

Temple, J. B. & Stevens, D. D. (February, 2000). Diversity & faculty mentoring programs: Just washing the windows or building a new foundation for diversity. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Chicago, IL.

Williams, E. A., Butt, G. W. & Soares, A. (1992). Student perceptions of a secondary postgraduate certificate in education course. Journal of Education for teaching, 18(3), 297-309.

Zeichner, K. M. & Gore, J. M. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 105-127). New York: Macmillan.

Zimpher, N. & Rieger, S. (1988). Mentoring teachers: What are the issues? Theory into practice, 27(3), 175-81.

Table 1: Comparison of traditional and new Turkish teacher education programs

Teacher Preparation Dimension	1982 Traditional. Prog., Univ. Ed. Faculty	1982 Trad. Prog. BA, acad. area + Cert.	1999 New Turkish teacher education Program
Length of program	4 years	Teaching Certif. 4 months	4-year undergraduate (UG) or Masters
Time in schools	8 weeks	none	10-24 weeks, 1 day-week + 2 intensives= 1 month
Lessons taught in schools	4, if trusted by mentor	none	4-8 expected, observed with written feedback
University supervisor role	Usually not visit schools	Usually not visit schools	Visits expected, at least 2 a term
Mentor teacher role	Not paid	Not paid	Paid, involved May have training
Teacher formation classes	39 credits over 4 year	12-15 credits for Certificate	39 over 4 years if UG 56 over 2 years if MA

TABLE 2: Mentor Teacher Survey Items: Means and Standard Deviations by Overall, Turkish native and non-native speakers (4=strongly agree; 3= agree; 2= disagree; 1= strongly disagree)

Survey Item	Overall Mean (S.D.) n= 25	Mean Turkish Native speakers N= 17	Mean Non-native Speakers N=8
1. Being a mentor was a positive professional growth experience for me.	3.34* (0.48)	3.44	3.13
2. I enjoyed working with the student teachers.	3.56 (0.51)	3.56	3.56
3. The student teacher taught one lesson, even a short lesson, in my class this term.	3.31 (1.02)	3.30	2.83
4. The university staff responded in a timely manner to my questions and concerns.	3.65 (0.49)	3.80	3.94
5. I believe it is important for us to train future teachers.	3.87 (0.33)	3.94	3.78
6. I learned something from the student teachers.	3.00 (0.59)	2.94	3.13
7. I believe that the student teachers learned a lot from this experience.	3.68 (0.48)	3.88	3.33
8. The student teachers took too much time.	2.32 (0.72)	2.36	2.25
9. The student teachers were responsive to feedback.	3.66 (0.48)	3.69	3.63
10. Having a student teacher helped me think more deeply about some of my own classroom practices.	3.30 (0.76)	3.27	3.38
11. I would like more training on how to be a more effective mentor for student teachers.	3.00 (0.92)	3.00	3.00
12. I would like to be a mentor for the student teachers again in School Experience I.	3.38 (0.49)	3.38	3.38

* Significant difference between Turkish native speakers and non-native speakers who were mentors (0.01)

TABLE 3: Survey means and standard deviations clustered by themes

Theme	Survey Item	Overall Mean n = 25
ST growth	7. ST learned a lot	3.68
	9. ST responsive to feedback	3.66
	3. ST taught one lesson	3.31
Mentor Growth	1. Positive growth experience	3.34
	2. Enjoyed	3.56
	6. Learned from ST	3.05
	10. Reflect on own practice	3.30
Mentor Future Role	5. Important to train future teachers	3.87
	11. Want more training	3.03
	12. Be a mentor next year	3.38
Univ. Relations	4. Positive university response	3.50
Too much time	8. ST took too much time	2.32

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Student teacher mentors in Turkey: New program challenges traditional relationships	
Author(s): Dannelle D. Stevens & Gulsen Demirezen	
Corporate Source: Bilkent University Ankara, Turkey	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Dannelle D Stevens	Printed Name/Position/Title: Dannelle D. Stevens Assoc. Prof
Organization/Address: Bilkent University 06533 Ankara, Turkey	Telephone: 90-312-290-2950 FAX: 312-266-
	E-Mail Address: stevensd@bilkent.edu.tr Date: April 4, 2002

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

University of Maryland
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Laboratory
College Park, MD 20742
Attn: Acquisitions

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)